

Serial No. 09/846,861
October 30, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated May 7, 2003
Page 4 of 6

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants ADD claim 5.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kato (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,707). Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,962). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-4.

Claim 1 recites:

"A vibrator comprising:
a vibrating body;
a driving unit for causing said vibrating body to vibrate in a predetermined vibrating direction; and
a driving monitoring unit provided in a barycentric region of said vibrating body for detecting vibration displacement in a driving direction of said vibrating body." (emphasis added)

Applicants' claim 1 recites the feature of "a driving monitoring unit provided in a barycentric region of said vibrating body for detecting vibration displacement in a driving direction of said vibrating body." With the improved features of claim 1, Applicants have been able to provide a vibrator capable of preventing disturbances in the vibration of the vibrating body in the driving direction caused by an unwanted rotating vibration (see, for example, the second full paragraph on page 10 of the originally filed Specification).

First, the Examiner has alleged in paragraph no. 2 on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action that the capacitance detection circuit **17** of **Fig. 1** of Kato teaches the feature of "a driving monitoring unit provided in a barycentric region of said vibrating body for detecting vibration displacement in a driving direction of said vibrating body" as recited in Applicants' claim 1. However, the capacitance detection circuit **17** of Kato is not even located on the vibrating body and clearly is **NOT** located in the barycentric region of the vibrating body as recited in Applicants' claim 1. In contrast, as clearly seen in Fig. 1 of Kato, the capacitance detection circuit 17 of Kato is disposed completely

Serial No. 09/846,861
October 30, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated May 7, 2003
Page 5 of 6

outside of the vibrating body. Further, Kato teaches in lines 62 and 63 of column 12 that the electrodes **33a** and **33b** connected to capacitance detection circuit **17** are used for y-displacement detection (Coriolis direction), **NOT** driving displacement detection (x-direction) as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, Kato fails to teach or suggest the feature of "a driving monitoring unit provided in a barycentric region of said vibrating body for detecting vibration displacement in a driving direction of said vibrating body" as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Next, the Examiner has alleged in paragraph no. 3 of the outstanding Office Action that displacement detectors **35** and **35'** shown in **Figs. 3, 7, and 14** of Yoshino et al. teach the feature of "a driving monitoring unit provided in a barycentric region of said vibrating body for detecting vibration displacement in a driving direction of said vibrating body" as recited in Applicants claim 1. However, Yoshino et al. clearly teaches in **Figs. 4-6**, and particularly in lines 3-7 of column 12, that the displacement detectors **35** and **35'** detect displacement in the **F** direction (Coriolis direction) and do not detect any displacement in the **a** direction (driving direction). Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, Yoshino et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of "a driving monitoring unit provided in a barycentric region of said vibrating body for detecting vibration displacement in a driving direction of said vibrating body" as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kato and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshino et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kato and Yoshino et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claim 1 of the present application. Claims 2-5 depend upon claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit

Serial No. 09/846,861
October 30, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated May 7, 2003
Page 6 of 6

that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a THREE-month extension of time, extending to November 7, 2003, the period for response to the Office Action dated May 7, 2003.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2003


Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080